Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0620GA-1 for Brooks County Board of Education

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. Brooks County School's (BCS's) vision of reform is broad and aimed at improving teaching and learning, but does not build on the four core educational assurance areas to articulate a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating achievement and increasing equity through "personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interest," for the reasons enumerated below.

2. BCS provides brief description of a vision of reform focusing on five major areas – Student Performance, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, Initiative Administration, Increasing Support Personnel, and Engaging Parents and Community. This vision indicates plans to address some of the four core assurance areas with the potential grant monies, but does not convincingly present the four core educational areas as existing work on which to build an approach to personalized learning. Indeed rather than attempting to show how they would proceed from this basis, they state "The Brooks County School district is ready to undergo a reform within our district. Our reform will focus on [the five areas noted above].

3. The corollary to this is that the application does not adequately articulate a "clear and credible approach" to addressing the goals of the competition to "accelerate" and "deepen" student learning "through personalized student support, grounded in common and individualized tasks that are based on student academic interests."
   - There is no mention of within the brief vision of personalized student support, tasks based on student academic interest, or other fundamental school or instructional re-design that would be likely to result in a comprehensive personalized learning environment. The words and concepts relating to personalized learning and personalized learning environments do not appear in the vision.
   - The vision presented overwhelmingly remains at the more general aspects of school improvement, as evidenced through their own vision statement that "these five projects will assist us in reaching our vision of **Creating a system of excellence for all learners**." [BCS emphasis].

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS meets this sub-criterion only partially.

2. BCS selected to use a whole-district approach to implementing their reform. This approach should in many ways positively support LEA- and school-level implementation:

   - By implementing in the whole district at once, BCS can more easily and quickly leverage change in policies, build momentum, and attempt a comprehensive approach to changing infrastructures and learning platforms/models.
   - There are also risks to this approach in larger districts, around district capacity to implement changes in all schools at once, but given the small size of the district, the risks are greatly decreased.
   - BCS does increase its chances of success by noting it will pay particular attention to the math/science area and closing gaps for the student-with-disability subgroup.

3. In terms of its responses to sub-criteria (a) – (c)

   - (a) BCS does not describe the process they used to select participating schools, but given that they are including all the schools in the district, this is appropriate. They also do not present a description of why they decided to use a whole-district approach. BCS does provide appropriate evidence in their school demographics charts that the participating schools/the district meets the competition's eligibility requirements (e.g. over 40% of students

- from low-income families, etc.).
- (b) and (c) BCS also meets the requirements of providing a list of the schools that will participate and the total number of participating students, those from low income families, those who are high needs, and participating educators.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS meet only part of this sub-criterion, in particular by providing a plan for implementing reform that is not of high quality.

2. Since BCS's proposal is being implemented district-wide for all students, all schools/students within the district are participating. Therefore the applicant does **not** have to address "how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools." The remainder of this criterion requires a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal "will help the applicant reach its outcome goals (e.g. the applicant's logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant

3. BCS provides a minimal description of their logic model or theory of change, mentioning only their intention to model the transformation at Brooks County High School at their three other schools, saying the other educators are "aware" of the high school reforms and "would welcome the same supports."

4. BCS also does not provide a "high quality" plan for how their reform proposal will help them reach their desired outcomes. Their plan, proposed in two brief paragraphs, is to "hire a district coordinator and administrative assistant to oversee the grant implementation at the district level," develop a timeline, meet monthly with principals to monitor implementation, develop a plan for professional learning, and oversee coaching and implementation support. These are the only activities, and they have none of the other five elements of high quality plans attached to them – broader goals, timelines, deliverables, parties responsible or the credibility lent by inclusion of these other elements, context, or references to additional information/evidence in other parts of the grant.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS does not meet all parts of this sub criterion to an acceptable level, including providing incomplete information in some areas.

2. BCS does confirm their Goals are equal to or exceed state ESEA targets.

3. (a) Many of their performance goals are ambitious yet might be achievable in the context of a comprehensive proposal that truly enables a personalized learning environment. However, given that the application focuses more largely on reform in the four assurance areas the goals are less likely to be achievable.

4. (a) In addition, some goals jump in an unrealistic way, particularly from baseline to the first year, when more comprehensive changes are unlikely to have had time to produce such an effect

   - E.g. 3rd grade reading , from 84% baseline to 95.05% in 2012-13, and SWD 3d grade social studies from 37% to 66.61%
   - 5th grad ELA SWD from 35% baseline to 84.27%

5. (b) Tables on decreases in achievement gaps over time are also problematic.

   - Those given (for SWD) are ambitious, but not necessarily achievable given that the proposal does not include a game-changing learning environment for the population (SWD).
   - Other achievement gaps (as defined in the notice) are not addressed at all.

6. (c) Graduation Rate information is incomplete, with some unrealistic projections:

   - baseline is missing for all subgroups
   - Increase for overall population from baseline to 12-13 goal is large for first year, given the time to implement strategies.

7. (d) College enrollment rate information is provided; however the jump from baseline to the first goal is large for the first year, given program implementation time.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. (1) and (1)(a) Applicant demonstrates record of success in improving learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, through

   - Awards: of Title 1 Distinguished District and Schools (all 4), awarded for meeting yearly progress and/or closing achievement gaps for economically disadvantaged
   - Increase in graduation rate (see next comment) and in ELA scores at elementary and upper levels from 88/82% to 90/93% and math from 66/56 to 83/80%.

2. (a) Despite awards for closing achievement gaps, as confirmed by state assessment data,

   - some gaps have remained large or increased, e.g. graduation gap between blacks and all students 2008-2011
   - performance by SWD remains an issue, as acknowledged by the applicant.

3. (b) Applicant demonstrates a record of success in achieving significant reform in Brookes County High School

   - Clear evidence that graduation rates have improved since 2008, rising from 58% to 76%; also documents improvement through award of National Title 1 distinguished school status.
   - Note: applicant does not identify whether the school is persistently low achieving or low performing as defined in the notice, but they are clearly school/district wide Title 1.

4. (c) Applicant demonstrates a track record of making student performance data available to stakeholders, but the frequency (annually, quarterly) is likely to be insufficient to "inform and improve instruction and services."

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS does not meet this criterion to a significant extent.

2. The applicant does not provide any general evidence of past strategies or plans to increase transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, or of making public school-by-school expenditure data for instruction, instructional and pupil support, and school administration personnel.

3. (a)-(d) In particular, the applicant does not include a description of the extent to which they already make available the four stated categories of school-level expenditure, but only that the data is available on the Open Georgia website.

4. The district does include a table with aggregated school level personnel and non-personnel expenditures, do not include the information by school.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCSs application does not substantially meet this sub selection criterion.

2. The district does not provide evidence of conditions and autonomy already existing under State statutory and regulatory requirements, and therefore does not describe how such conditions and autonomy support the implementation of the personalized learning environments described in their proposal.

3. Instead, in this section, they describe professional learning and support activities for teachers and leaders, stemming from the state and district level, which is important in its own right, but not directly relevant to the criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS provides evidence of some meaningful stakeholder engagement and support, but does not fulfill all parts of this criterion.

2. (a) Met. BCS offers a detailed description how students, families, teachers and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal through meetings, brainstorms, completion of graphic organizers, and lists the feedback that was "heavily considered when preparing the proposal."

3. (a) (ii) Insufficient evidence for meeting sub-criterion. Applicant signed off the assurance that they had at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in this notice) support the proposal, however they did not provide useable evidence of this threshold level of support in the application:

   - They included 250 pages of completed teacher surveys in the appendices,
   - But there is no tally of the number or percentage of teachers who supported the proposal.

   Given the significant changes to teachers' roles and responsibilities in a transition to a personalized learning environment, this is a significant omission.

4. (b) Applicant included letters of support from key stakeholders both within the school community and outside – including a range of the business community, civic organizations, community-based organizations, and institutions of higher learning.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS does not meet this criterion to a significant extent.

2. Instead of providing a plan "for an analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal in addressing these gaps," the district describes a five-year strategic plan that includes some general identification of needs and gaps in the district but does not focus on status with regard to personalized learning environments, and instead describes in some detail a process to engage stakeholders

3. For the plan it does address, the applicant includes three of the six elements necessary for a "high quality plan," outlining activities, timeline, and parties responsible, but not including goals, deliverables, and credibility. The lack of goals is particularly critical, as their explicit inclusion would have linked the plan activities to the overall objective of analyzing the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS has provided a well-constructed plan to improve teaching and learning but has not completely addressed the requirements of this selection criterion for a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment:

2. In terms of the quality of the plans provided:

   - Applicant describes a plan that includes five of the six "high quality plan" elements required: goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and persons responsible.

- In terms of the sixth element, credibility for the plan, this is an issue in terms of addressing this selection criterion, given the coverage questions below, and the fact that even the personalized learning approaches included here are not reflected in an identifiable way within the applicant's vision or proposed budget (which is keyed to the five more general goals in the vision).

3. In terms of coverage, the plan provided addresses approximately half of the features that the application says must be included in (a), (b), and (c), with sub-criteria (6 out of 12 features). Key features missing from the plan include: a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development, a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, ongoing and regular/frequently updated data (there is an item for purchasing a software system to assist teachers in having immediate access to benchmark data, but personalized learning requires something closer to real time (task, daily or weekly), personalized learning recommendations, accommodations and strategies for high need students, and mechanisms to provide training to students to ensure they understand how to use tools for tracking and managing their learning.

4. The other features that are included in the applicant's plan are important to improve learning in standard environments, but the features listed above as missing or not completely addressed are particularly important in creating a student-centered, personalized learning environment. Most importantly, the plan includes some good parts of the puzzle (developing middle and high school leadership teams to lead community service projects, increasing the use of digital media sources) but there is insufficient evidence of planning for overarching systems, platforms or the re-design of instructional and school environments to an extent that would increase chances of success for major steps to personalized learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	11

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS has provided a well-constructed plan for an approach to teaching and leading, although it has not completely addressed the requirements of this selection criterion for a high-quality plan for helping educators increase their capacity to enable the full implementation of personalized learning

2. In terms of the quality of the plans provided:

   - Applicant describes a plan that includes five of the six "high quality plan" elements required: goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and persons responsible.
   - In terms of the sixth element, credibility for the plan, this is an issue in terms of addressing this selection criterion, given the coverage questions below, and the fact that even the personalized learning approaches included here are not reflected in an identifiable way within the applicant's vision or proposed budget (which is keyed to the five more general goals in the vision).

3. In terms of coverage, the plan addresses most of the activities that the application requires in sub-criteria (a)(i)-(iv)(b)(i)-(1iii), and (c) (i)-(ii) (see exceptions in next comment), including a professional learning plan, time for PD and conferences, and coaching arrangements relating to these topics.

4. The applicant asserts that the learning plan will include development for topics like "personalized learning environments" and "performance-based and project-based tasks," however there is no detail or examples of what that PD would address, so it is difficult to judge the credibility of these parts of the plan. The plan also appears to be missing some of the required features, such as:

   - actionable information to help educators identify optimal learning approaches
   - processes and tools that help educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to student needs and interests
   - the tools to create and share new resources.

5. With regard to (c) (i) The plan does include information on the district's teacher and leader evaluation systems (TKES and LKES), which the district has experience piloting and should provide for the information to help school leaders assess and improve individual and collective educator effectiveness.

6. For section (d), as no separate plan was provided, the applicant's high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers was gleaned from sections of the tables provided in C1 and C2 as well as the Georgia Great Teachers and Leaders Effectiveness Systems tables in the Appendix. These activities address the issue through professional learning to enhance existing teacher effectiveness, design of a compensation rubric for highly effective teachers and leaders, and revising the recruitment plan to attract

highly effective teachers, as well as input provided by TKES. Taken together, this provides a good plan within existing teaching structures, though it does not address instructional re-design options such as creating master teacher positions or co-teaching positions that would enable highly effective teachers to guide more students more quickly.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS does not include a high quality plan with all five or six elements (timelines, deliverables etc.). However since most of the features required by the plan are already in place and the applicant's district is small, it is possible to judge the quality of the plan from the information provided.

2. The applicant provides evidence of already providing for most of the practices, policies, and procedures required, including:

   - A central office Leadership Team to provide support
   - Provision of flexibility and autonomy for schools over schedules and personnel decisions.
   - Some credit earning opportunities, such as credit recovery and Georgia Virtual School.
   - Assertion that student are given a choice of task to demonstrate mastery of standards (teachers having had training for this provides suggestive evidence)

3. The applicant provides insufficient or no evidence for other practices, e.g.

   - Autonomy over school calendar (allowed "input" not autonomy)
   - Giving all students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery rather than the amount of time spent on the topic. From the evidence provided this only applies to credit recovery. This would require instructional and/or environment re-design, which does not appear to be part of the applicant's plan.
   - Provide learning resources that are adaptable and fully accessible.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS does not include a high quality plan, providing brief status or activity descriptions with the other five elements required for a high quality plan (timelines, deliverables etc.).

2. In terms of coverage in the plan, the applicant describes infrastructure pieces that are mostly already in place, but to address personalized learning in a comprehensive way, as required by the grant application, it would be reasonable to see a plan for the introduction of new infrastructure to underpin a personalized learning environment, and/or steps to integrate the existing infrastructure pieces to enable ways for students to start to take ownership of their own learning experiences of all sorts.

3. The applicant provides evidence of existing infrastructure in terms of a student information system, statewide longitudinal data system and one digital instructional product (Study Island). There is no evidence that the applicant intends to implement an electronic learning management system or platform for blended learning.

4. There is no mention of (a) ensuring access, or (b) training and technical support for students, parents or educators in this section, although such training and support for teachers is mentioned in earlier sections.

4. The plan does not address (c) exportable information, open data formats, or (c) the interoperability of data.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS provides four out of the six elements of a "high quality plan" for the "high quality approach" required for this criterion, providing Activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible, but not goals and additional backing of credibility.

2. The Applicant provides evidence of a monthly cycle for schools to receive "feedback and support," involving a monthly monitoring form,monthly meetings with each principal, monthly focus walks to gauge implementation, monthly analysis and public sharing of the data collected. There is less evidence, however, of how this cycle will engage opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvement.

3. There is insufficient evidence of feedback on progress being given to anyone other than school administration - e.g. feedback to teachers, students or other stakeholders.

4. In addition, the evidence provided is unclear in terms of whether there is a specific focus on feedback on progress on project goals and on return on investment for Race to the Top funds, as required by the criterion.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. Applicant provides a faily brief but actionable plan for communication activities with a range of internal and external stakeholders, including communication and events with parents, community organizations, civic groups, and the Family Connection Collaborative.

2. This plan includes four of the six elements of a high quality plan, although this is not called for in the application: activity, timeline, deliverable, and parties responsible

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS provides performance measures with annual target for all students and subgroups.

2. Applicant does not describe, for each measure, items (a) to (c) - its rational for selection, how it will provide leading information tailored to their proposed plan, or how it will review and improve the measure over time

3. The annual targets seem suitably ambitious, with some anomalies (see comment 5 below)

4. Whether the targets are achievable depends on the applicant's plan for a coherent and comprehensive approach to creating a personalized learning environment.   Details on such a plan (as opposed to continued reform to generally improve teaching and learning within current classroom and grade formats) within the application are limited, and the annual targets provided here match that, in the sense that many of the targets are generic +5 percentage point increases per year – rather than specific take-off trajectories for program launches or redesign stages. In addition some targets appear to be unrealistic – e.g. the initial year jumps in students served by highly effective teachers (since their strategy for this depends on training and recruiting rather than extending the reach of existing highly performing teachers.

5. There are also some confusing targets:

   - Reduction in discipline targets are provided in numbers not percentages
   - Work-related high needs on track targets also appear to be in numbers, but look like they should be percentages - ?

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

1. This section was missing from the BCS application.

2. Section (E)(2) mentions the communication of information on the quality of investments, but no further information on plans to evaluate effectiveness or make on going changes to activities to improve results or return on investment were provided.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS identifies funds that will support the project, but there are no funds other than the RTT-D funds.

2. The budget appears complete, and reasonable and sufficient to support the plan given of generally increasing quality with existing whole classroom and school approaches. Since the sub-budgets are developed around the five more general reform goals in the vision, and not the personalized learning strategies discussed in Section C, there is insufficient information to judge whether the budget would be sufficient for creating personalized learning environments.

3. The applicant identifies the one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs, but does not include strategies to ensure the long-term sustainability of personalized learning environments

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant does not provide a full high quality plan for sustainability with goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, parties responsible and evidence for credibility.

2. It does provide a plan for building capacity to sustain their projects following the grant period, however in most activity areas it simply asserts that the activity will continue because processes will have become embedded in the system and those trained will continue to develop the activities. The plan does not sufficiently address:

   - How the applicant will add sources of funding outside of RTT-D and existing district and per pupil funds (it does state that "increased efforts to secure funding after RT3 ends should be a priority for all stakeholders" and mentions that the efforts "may include applying for various grants, local education, city and county funding, and community partner contributions." However, given they have no track record in attracting funding, this is inadequate as a credible plan for success.
   - Any specific assumptions, potential sources or uses of funds that they would pursue.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. BCS mentions three existing partnerships that provide useful supports and that they plan to coordinate, but this is not sufficient as a description of a "coherent and sustainable partnership... to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1."

2. The applicant identifies five population level results, including both educational and family/community measures.

3. The applicant provides a brief, three step plan to address the competitive priority, but this includes insufficient or no description of the elements required in competitive preference priority section 3 (a) through (d) – how the partnership would track indicators, use data, track resources, improve results over time, etc.

4. The applicant provides no description of how the partnership would integrate education and other services (section 4),

or how the partnership would build the capacity of staff in the schools to assess needs, identify the needs and assets of the community, create a decision making process, etc. (Section 5)

5. The applicant provides performance measure desired results for the educational measures but not for the two family/community measures they propose.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not met the Absolute Priority on personalized learning environments because it did not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create a personalized learning environment (as described in this priority, with all of its various elements) designed to improve teaching and learning (in the ways described) and improve student achievement, decrease achievement gaps (and attain the other goals described).

While Brookes County can show a record of prior success increasing student performance and some mixed success in closing achievement gaps in recent years, as well as good progress on the core assurance areas, their vision of reform (focused on five major areas – Student Performance, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, Initiative Administration, Increasing Support Personnel, and Engaging Parents and Community) provides plans to further address the four core assurance areas, rather than presenting them as existing work on which to build an approach to personalized learning. Indeed rather than attempting to show how they would proceed from this basis, they state "The Brooks County School district is ready to undergo a reform within our district. Our reform will focus on [the five areas noted above].

The corollary to this is that Brooks County does not provide sufficient evidence in this application of a vision, strategy and high quality plans to create a learning environment that is sufficiently re-designed to successfully implement personalized learning (as described in this priority) and to achieve the next level of performance goals proposed by the district.

The applicant's proposed strategies and plans, as described in the application, address some important practices beneficial to students, inlcuding general improvement of teaching and learning practices, differentiation within the traditional classroom paradigm, and personalized supports for high need students. But the application includes insufficient evidence of credible plans to redesign learning to situate it within a personalized environment (for example, the establishment of learning management systems; progression for all students based on mastery rather than time on topic; learning and curriculum choices driven by student interest as well as skill level and learning style; expansion of student access to the most effective teachers (as opposed to increasing the numbers of effective teachers over time); integration into core courses of blended learning and other strategies to address the adaptability and cost implications of personalize learning, or other core features that would be likely to "dramatically transform the learning environment" in the ways targeted in this application.

Total	210	82

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0620GA-2 for Brooks County Board of Education

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has outlined 5 areas for reform. Administration of grant initiatives is not a valid reform area. Each of these other goals can help accelerate student achievement. Deepening student learning has not been addressed. Increasing equity through personalized student support has not been addressed.

The use of data to inform the reforms is commendable.

The applicant has not been specific enough in articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. All criteria must be addressed.

The applicant's vision for reform does not adequately address how it will buildi on the work in the four core assurance areas.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district will include all of its schools in the proposed reform. The list of schools is adequately described and the charts mention all of the required criteria.

All of the participating schools meet the eligibility requirements.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district is currently participating in many different programs such as the Principal's Network and a School Improvement Grant. The district has demonstrated the willingness and capacity for transformational change. The applicant did not address how the reform proposal will translate into meaningful reform and did not address any outcome goals related outside of the goals of the current programs. The major reform areas were not threaded throughout this section and were not addressed adequately. The applicant is including all schools in the plan; therefore the reform will be district-wide.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated ambitious yet achievable goals in the areas A-C. The goal to double college enrollment from 25% to 50% in 5 years is possibly too ambitious.

A--The applicant has achievable goals of improvement in the areas of reading, math, science, language arts, and social studies at every level.

B--The applicant has only noted decreasing acheivement gaps for students with disabilities, but has not addressed racial gaps.

C--The graduation rate goals are achievable.

D--This goal is too ambitious.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has won many awards over the last few years for improving learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. They have also made steady overall gains since 2008 in every demographic in state competency tests. Brooks is a small district with only two elementaries, so there is not necessarily a lowest-achieving school. Brooks has made numerous efforts to make student performance available to all through community stakeholder meetings, online resources, and a parent partner group.

Brooks has achieved a steady increase in graduation rates since 2008.

Brooks has made steady gains in achievement in the areas of reading and math.

College enrollment is not addressed.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has met all the criteria of this section by making available all personnel salaries at each level and all non-personnel expenditures. A more specific explanation about the Open Georgia website is needed demonstrating that all personnel salaries for instructional staff and teachers is available.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has demonstrated that they have sufficient autonomy to implement their plan as evidenced by participation in TKES and LKES. They have implemented many programs within the state of Georgia and participated in professional learning provided by the Georgia Department of Education.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has demonstrated that every stakeholder participated in the the development of the proposal through department meetings, faculty input, parent partners meetings, online and print resources, and the student leadership team.

Teachers attended meetings with the principals and voiced their support.

Brooks has included letters of support from numerous stakeholders including local organizations, local businesses, an institution of higher learning.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has a high quality plan for analyzing its current status in implementing personalized learning environments; however, the district has not already identified its needs and gaps. At this point there should be some identifiable needs and gaps that are already identified and that can be addressed in this section.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified a few goals linked to college and career-ready standards including SAT and ACT prep, integrating STEM objectives, offering dual enrollment, but the element of college and career readiness should be threaded throughout this section of the proposal. The goals related to this objective are minimal.

Deep learning experiences were not identified as well as the other aspects of sub-section (a) such as exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives and mastering academic content through critical thinking. Goal setting and teamwork were addressed at the elementary and middle school level.

Digital learning is inadequately addressed. The applicant only briefly mentions the integration of technology including student response systems, interactive white boards, and ipads. The student response system should be explained.

Ongoing and regular feedback is inadequately addressed. Interventions are mentioned but nothing specific about frequently updating data.

This section does not adequately address many of the criteria.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is considerably weak in all sections. College and career readiness are addressed throughout the section, but many sub-section criteria are missing or inadequately addressed such as frequently measuring student progress, using high quality learning resources, and implementing training to continuously improve these goals.

The implementation of that Teacher Keys Evaluation System is commendable but a more comprehensive explanation of the usage of ongoing feedback in regards to evaluation is needed.

The entire section speaks to much in generalities and gives little explanation of specfics that address the criteria within this section.

Section D is addressed via the participation of teachers in the Department of Education's Leadership Academy.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated the critieria concerning the central office and leadership teams.

Section A is addressed by the central office establishing a leadership team to monitor the implementation of the continuous improvement plan.

Principals are given flexibility for their schedule and their budget.

Mastery learning is not adequately addressed. The district offers options to repair credit and gives students the option to to demonstrate mastery; however, the element of demonstrating mastery of standards "at multiple times and in multiple ways" is not discussed.

Criterion (e) is not addressed. The applicant has not discussed students with disabilities or English learners.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has addressed every criteria in this section thoroughly. The resources provided to all stakeholders are adequate and the district has demonstrated an ability to implement their proposal within their existing infrastructure.

Students have access to before and after school tutoring and Saturday School. Parents have access to the parent resource room. Parents have access to a parent portal and Study Island.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has devised a quality plan to monitor and measure the progress. The timeline is orderly and appropriate. The applicant addresses publicly sharing the information in (E)(2).

The applicant will monitor the gant monthly by conducting monthly meetings whith each principal to review the timeline. The

results will be shared at monthly faculty meetings.

The strategy for implementing continuous improvement is not thorough. More detail is needed.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The criteria in this section is addressed at a superior level. The district has demonstrated a precise plan for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders via parent information nights, parent partners, and parent university workshop.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a sufficient amount of performance measures that thoroughly address every criteria for the measures.

The applicant did not provide a response to sub-sections A-C in any part of this section. A narrative should have been added to address this criteria.

When addressed, the goals are ambitious yet achievable.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was not addressed in the proposal.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has been very specific with regard to personnel salaries and the rationale for each position. The fringe benefits are adequately described.

The applicant has described all the funds that will support the project and the they are reasonable and sufficient.

In regards to travel, the request for $50,000 for teachers to attend conferences and workshops should be detailed further.

The applicant has adequately described the one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has adequately described six distinct building capacities that are sustainable during and after the term of the grant. Teachers will be provided with ongoing training after the grant. Monitoring and evaluation tools will continue to be used after the grant. State and local government leaders are mentioned in building capacity #5, but financial support is not mentioned.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Brooks has formed numerous partnerships within the community including the Family Connection Collaborative. This fulfills

the criteria for section 1.

Brooks has identified five population-level desired results for criteria 2. They include both educational results and education outcomes.

Brooks has not addressed sections 3-6.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated commitment to improving student performance and teacher & leader effectiveness. The applicant intends to increase support personnel to enhance learning and has also demonstrated the ability to engage parents and the community. The applicant has enhanced professional development and teacher training in order to place highly qualified teachers in each classroom who will help to deepend student learning. The applicant has made a considerable effort to decrease the achievement gap for students with disabilities.

Total	210	133

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0620GA-3 for Brooks County Board of Education

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a vision for reform that focuses on five areas:

1. Improving Student Performance

2. Improving Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

3. Administration of Grant Initiatives

4. Increasing Support Personnel

5. Engaging Parents and Community

The applicant scores medium. In the narrative, a connection has not been provided to the Core Educational Assurances. There is no mention of the adoption of standards and assessments, building a data system, or turn around schools.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates an approach to support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation:

(a) The applicant includes a description of the process - all four schools will participate

(b) The applicant includes a list of all schools participating

(c) The total number participating

- Total Number of Schools - 4
- Total Number of Educators - 139
- Total Number of participating students - 2283
- Total Number of participating high-need students - 815
- Total Number of participating low-income students - 1927
- Applicant Percentage of students identified as low-income 83.57%

The applicant scores high including all required information.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a plan of reform and change at their four elementary schools based on the success of School Improvement Grant initiatives at their high school. The district will hire a district coordinator and administrative assistant to oversee the grant implementation. The coordinator will develop a timeline of initiatives, and a plan for professional development.

The applicant scores low. There is no explanation of what is happening at the high schools on which to base evidence of successful reform and change. Initiatives, timelines and professional development required for this grant should have been submitted with the grant - and not developed after the receipt of the reward.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has included goals for improved student outcomes.

(a) The applicant provides a detailed table listing ambitious yet achievable goals for increasing performance on summative assessments. Goals are listed by subject by grade level and broken out into various demographic groups.

(b) The applicant provides a detailed table listing ambitious yet achievable goals for decreasing achievement gaps

(c) The applicant provides a detailed table listing ambitious yet achievable goals for increasing graduation rates

(d) The applicant provides a detailed table listing ambitious yet achievable goals for increasing graduation rates

(e) (Optional and not completed)

The applicant scores high for establishing ambitious yet achievable goals that meet or exceed state requirements based on state provided performance targets posted for 2011.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	**Score**
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a clear track record of success:

(a) The applicant has a clear record of success improving student learning outcomes, closing achievement gaps and increasing the graduation rate.

- Applicant received the 2010 Title I Distinguished School District - demonstrating the greatest gains in the percent of Economically Disadvantaged students meeting or exceeding state standards.
- Applicant recieved 2011 national Title I Distinguished School - Closing achievement gap between economically

disadvantaged students and all students
- Applicant includes a table detailing increased graduation rates - 2008 - 2011

(b) The applicant demonstrates a clear record of success utilizing the awarded School Improvement Grant at their high school.

- Added content instructional coaches
- Added a technology coach
- Added a transition coach
- Added a remedial reading class
- Expanded credit recovery, AP and Honors classes
- Added a Family Engagement Coordinator
- Offered Saturday and Summer classes

(c) The applicant demonstrates a record of making student performance data available to stakeholders.

- There is an annual stakeholder meeting in July
- Stakeholders are invited through a variety of methods: calling, flyers, newspaper notices and facebook
- Stakeholders are provided the opportunity to review the School Improvement Plan
- A Parent Partner Group has been established and meets quarterly
- The applicant hosts Parent Information Nights

The applicant scores medium. The applicant did not include information on college enrollment. Although the applicant included information regarding transformation at the high school level - no statistics were provided to document success. We have no evidence of data gathered from the high school by the district that verifies the success of the initiatives listed. There is no evidence provided of student performance data that is available to stakeholders such as students and parents on a daily basis.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of transparency:

(a) A table is provided detailing total actual personnel salaries at the school level

(b) A table is provided detailing total actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only

(c) A table is provided detailing total actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only

(d) A table is provided detailing total actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level

A budget is included in the appendix.

The district scores low Although the above tables are provided, no evidence has been submitted that verifies that the district provides a high level of transparency in its processes, practices and investments including making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular k - 12 instruction, instruction, instructional support, pupil support and school administration.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements.

The applicant is working within the State of Georgia guidelines for full implementation of the Common Core. The applicant participates in TKES (Teacher Keys Evaluation System) and LKES (Leader Keys Evaluation System).

The applicant scores low. The applicant has not described the personalized learning environment to be implemented; therefore it is difficult to determine if successful conditions and sufficient autonomy exist.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement and support.

(a) The applicant has included a description of how students, families, teachers and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal. At the September Administrator Meeting - all participants were given a graphic organizer and provided with the opportunity to comment on the grant proposal. Small-group discussion then followed. Each principal repeated the activity at their schools allowing for teacher input. Parents and partners were engaged in the process during the September Parent and Partner meeting. The same activity was completed with Student Leaders at the high school.

- (i) The applicant explains the direct engagement and support from teachers.
-
- (ii) The applicant does not provide evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal

(b) Letters of support from key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, etc. have been included.

The applicant scores medium. The process is clear of gathering support and feedback is clear; however their is no letter from the teachers indicating support, or that 70% are in agreement with the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores low. The applicant proposes a five year strategic plan to identify and close gaps, but again has not defined the personalized learning environment and the logic behind the reform proposal - including needs and gaps that the plan will address.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a plan to:

Improve student learning

- Increase the number of students who graduate on time
- Increase the number of students who demonstrate work ready skills
- Decrease retention rates in grades k - 8
- Increase number of students in grades 3 - 8 who demonstrate meeting or exceeding standards as measured by the Criterion Competency Reference Test in all content areas
- Decrease achievement gaps between students with disabilities and all students
- Increase number of students meeting or exceeding standards as measured by the End of Course tests in all content areas

Objectives for Project 1 Improving Student Performance

- To create high-quality instructional environments
- To master critical content and skills
- To make date driven decisions
- To improve educator's access to instructional tools to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards
- To increase the use of digital media sources
- To ensure that students develop the knowledge and skills to be college and career ready

Objectives for Project Improving Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

- To provide teachers and leaders with quality job embedded professional learning

Objectives for Project Engaging Parents and Community

- To increase parent and community engagement

(a) With the support of parents and educators:

- (i) All students understand what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals - was not addressed
- (ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college and career ready standards and graduation - adequately addressed
- (iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest - was not addressed
- (iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning - was not addressed
- (v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits - adequately addressed

(b) With the support of parents and educators to ensure that each student has access to:

- (i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development - was not addressed
- (ii) Instructional approaches and environments - was not addressed
- (iii) High-quality content - adequately addressed
- (iv) Ongoing and regular feedback
    - (A) Frequently updated individual student data - was not addressed
    - (B) Personalized learning recommendations - was not addressed
- (v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies - adequately addressed

(c) Training and support to students that they will understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning- was not addressed.

The applicant scores low. The indicators that the applicant included were adequately addressed. The applicant also included a table detailing the activities, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties; however, there is no mention of the development of personalized learning environments and many of the grant indicators were not addressed in the proposal.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan:

Objectives:

- To support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments
- To ensure that students graduate on time and are college and career ready
- To ensure that all staff members are high effective teachers and principals
- To ensure that individual and collective educator effectiveness
- To improve educators access to data tools to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards

C(2) All participating school leaders have training, policies, tools, data, and resource that structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress.

(a) All participating educators engage in training and in professional teams

- (i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies - personalized learning has not been defined by the applicant - the proposal lacks clarity
- (ii) Adopt content and instruction - adequately addressed
- (iii) Frequently measure student progress - frequency and types of assessment were not addressed
- (iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback - feedback was not addressed

(b) All participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress

- (i) Actionable information - was not defined or addressed
- (ii) High-quality learning resources - were not defined
- (iii) Processes and tools to match student needs - was not defined or addressed

(c) All participating school leaders have training, policies, tools, data, and resources to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress

- (i) Information, district teacher evaluation system, collective educator effectiveness and school culture for the purpose of

continuous school improvement - adequately addressed

- (ii) Training, systems, and practices increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps - training specific to achievement gaps was not addressed

(d) The applicant demonstrates evidence of a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals - adequately addressed

The applicant scores low. The indicators listed with evidence were adequate to meet grant criteria; however, the personalized learning environment that the applicant is trying to achieve has not been defined. The provided plan lacks clarity and depth - what does the personalized learning environment that the district is trying to achieve look like and how will it be supported by teachers and leaders within the district. The key goals as listed under a, b, c and d indicate whether the applicant has adequately addressed or not addressed the key goals of the grant.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan for:

(a) Organizing the LEA central office - the applicant has established a central office leadership team

(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools - the applicant has established leadership teams within each school. Principals are given autonomy with regard to scheduling, hiring, and budgeting,

(c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery - high school and middle school students are given the opportunity for credit recovery and credit repair

(d) Giving student the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways - teachers use the Georgia Instructional Framework to guide the sequence of teaching and learning. Students are provided choice whenever possible

(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students - was not addressed

The applicant scores medium. There is minimal evidence on opportunities for students to demonstrate progress and earn credit based on mastery. Small group instruction, flexible grouping, and differentiated instruction are not addressed. There is minimal evidence for providing students with the opportunity to demonstrate standards at multiple time and in comparable ways. The key goals of providing learning resources and instructional practices was not addressed.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a plan:

(a) Ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school - Parent Resource Room, bi - monthly Parent University sessions, Parents have access to a private portal that allows the review of student assessments, daily work, absences, tardies, etc. Through this portal, parents also have access to the States Longitudinal Data System

(b)Ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support - technical support was not addressed

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems - the district uses Infinite Campus for student data and is in the process of moving to Munis for finance.

(d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems - interoperable systems were not addressed.

The district scores medium. Two indicators were not addressed, the areas of technical support and interoperable data systems. For c, the district is moving in that direction but is not there yet so it is difficult to determine how successful their

efforts in this area will be.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan for continuous improvement.

The applicant scores low. To determine progress the applicant will develop a form for monthly completion by the principal at each school Additional information will be gathered from Focus Walks specifically targeting grant initiatives.The information gathered from these forms will be analyzed and shared at an annual meeting with parents. As the form is not developed - it is hard to determine if high-quality information will be gathered. The gathering and analysis of student information should also be a part of the process. And timely and regular feedback to the community suggests more than an annual presentation.

Additionally, parents, students and community members should also be solicited for feedback regarding the continuous improvement of the plan.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores medium. The applicant details many strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Students should also be included in this process as they are stakeholders too. Below is a list of ongoing communication provided by the applicant.

- Parent Information Night Minutes
- Parent Invittaion Flyers
- Newspaper articles
- Parent Information Nigh
- School Messenger
- Parent Partners Agenda and Minutes
- Parent University

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant scores low. The applicant provides a total of 36 performance measures. The rationale was not included - nor were methods for providing rigorous, timely and formative leading information and a plan to review the measure over time and determine whether it was sufficient to gauge progress.

	Available	Score
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a response.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budgetary plan includes:

(a) An identification for all funds that will support the project - all funds are coming from the grant

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal - it is still unclear how the applicant will develop personalized learning environments so determining reasonableness and sufficiency is not possible.

(c) Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities

- (i) A description of the funds - the funds are listed but not described. For example throughout the grant there is mention of a student data system - but I do not see this listed in the proposed budget.
- (ii) Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. - was not addressed

The applicant scores low. It is unclear how the budget is reasonable and sufficient for the proposal as the vision for the proposal remains unclear.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has an adequate plan for sustaining the goals of the project after the grant has expired.

- Proficiency training will remain a priority
- Training in outcome data structure and analysis will continue
- Teacher evaluation based on teacher effectiveness will continue
- Benchmarks will continue
- Increased efforts to secure funding from stakeholders such as local educational, city and county funding

The applicant scores medium. The applicant detailed examples listed above are evidence of the plan to sustain the grant proposal; however, funding efforts are not funding and the proposal will not be able to continue without a commitment from the district to spend money.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**8**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) The applicant provides evidence of coherent and sustainable partnerships that support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1.

- Partnered with local health agencies
- Partnered with local law enforcement agencies
- Partnered with institutions of Higher Learning
- Developed Community Partners in Education

(2) The applicant has identified no more than 10 population-level desired results that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top proposal and include educational and other education outcomes

- The applicant has identified 5 population groups

(3) The applicant has described how the partnership will:

- (a) Track the selected indicators (only for the student populations)
- (b) Target its resources - utilizes the resources of the health care and law enforcement agencies
- (c) Develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students - was not addressed
- (d) Improve results - may use performance measures from E3

(4) The applicant has described the integration of education with other services

- Mentors for students

Incentives for students
- Help fund field trips
- Classroom volunteers
- Providing extra clothing
- Providing holiday gifts

(5) The applicant has described how it will build the capacity of staff in participating schools - through the development of professional learning

(6) The applicant has identified its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the desired results for students - through the development of professional learning

The applicant scores high. The applicant has not addressed how it will extend the strategy beyond the participating students. Additionally, although 5 population groups were identified, tracking mechanisms were only included for student populations. It is not clear how the applicant will track progress with parents and guardians and the business community.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not met Absolute Priority 1. The applicant has not coherently and comprehensively addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significant improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and support for students and educators that are aligned with college and career ready standards and graduation requirements.

The applicant focuses significantly on the professional development of teachers and principals, but fails to clearly make a connection as to how this will personalize learning for students. How the student personalized learning environment will change with the implementation of this grant is not defined or clearly described within the proposal.

For this reason, the applicant fails to meet Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	83